



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/659,558	09/11/2000	Anita Wai-Ling Huang	AM9-99-0159	4686

21254 7590 10/22/2004

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/659,558

Applicant(s)

HUANG ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.
3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the term "object" in the claim language has not been properly or specifically defined in the specification. One who traces the term "object" may find it in phrases such as "object of the invention", "entries (or classes of objects) that the user wants to access", "predetermined objects on a web page", "classify its contents according to objects (i.e., different services or classes)," etc. Thus, when it comes to determining what is "predetermined objects on a web page", it becomes ambiguous as to whether the web page itself is an object or some displayed elements on the web page (i.e., text, URL links, or images in their fundamental units) are objects of concern.

Art Unit: 2154

Further, it is ambiguous between a web page (which by itself is a displayed object) that is accessed through a link object and the link object itself because the claim language does not distinguish them.

For prior art rejections in this office action, the term “predetermined objects on a web page” is being construed as including any discernible elements on the web page, and the linking and linked web pages itself.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. Claims 1-6 and 37-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barrett et al. (hereafter “Barrett”) [U.S. Pat. No. 5727129].

6. As to claim 1, Barrett teaches the invention as claimed including a method of displaying predetermined objects on a web page accessed by a user, comprising: one of displaying only those objects of said web page which said user has accessed a predetermined number of times previously, and displaying only those objects of said web page which said user has specified in advance [col.3, lines 12-21; i.e., by pressing the “back” or “left” button, one of the previously viewed pages (each have been accessed at least once) can be redisplayed].

7. As to claims 2-4, Barrett further teaches that the method further comprising:

- sensing a number of times a user visits a website [col.4, lines 5-7];

Art Unit: 2154

- sensing links for objects and other interactive objects on a home page of a website, accessed by said user; and
- sensing classes of objects to which the links and other interactive objects belong [e.g., 28, 32, Fig.4; note that the “classes” here is being interpreted as a “parent” or “child” that relates to an underlying page];
- wherein said sensing is performed automatically.

[Abstract; note that sensing and parsing links for objects and other interactive objects on a page is part of a browser's function].

8. As to claims 6-7, Barrett teaches automatically prioritizing or deprioritizing parts of a web service associated with said web page that are frequently or less frequently used by said user [Abstract: lines 11-16; i.e., based on the frequency of use, a page can be per-downloaded (i.e., prioritized) to facilitate the browsing process].

9. As to claims 37-44, since the features in these claims can also be found in claims 1-4 above, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-4.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herz [U.S. Pat. No. 6460036].

Art Unit: 2154

11. As to claim 1, Herz teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method of displaying predetermined objects on a web page accessed by a user based on profiles established regarding the object and the user's interest [Abstract], wherein the user's interest is in terms determined by several factors including previous access history of the objects [col.4, lines 5-7; col.28, lines 59-64] and explicit expression of interest through positive feedback [col.6, lines 3-20; col.9, lines 31-34; col.14, lines 15-31; col.17, lines 13-28; i.e., Herz teaches displaying only those objects which are highly matched to the ones a user has provided feedback in the past].

Herz does not specifically teach that the web pages displayed is based on those that have been previously accessed for a predetermined number of times.

However, Herz teaches ranking all the potential (or desirable) objects and using similarity threshold as a criterion for selecting the objects (or web pages) to be displayed.

Thus it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that, based on Herz's similarity measure, Herz's ranking process tends to put the previously highly accessed objects at the top of the rank because Herz's similarity measure would naturally be boiled down to the "predetermined number of times" for objects that have been previously accessed (i.e., their attributes are well established in the "target profile interest summary" and therefore would receive higher scores in the ranking process.

12. As to claims 2 and 4, Herz teaches that the method further comprising:

- sensing a number of times a user visits a website [col.4, lines 5-7]; and

Art Unit: 2154

- sensing links for objects and other interactive objects on a home page of a website, accessed by said user [col.12, lines 18-36; col.60, line 67 – col.61, line 3], wherein said sensing is performed automatically .

13. As to claim 3, Herz teaches that the method further comprising: sensing classes of objects to which the links and other interactive objects belong [col.7, lines 39-48; col.71, line 56- col.72, line 4].

14. As to claim 5, Herz teaches that the method further comprising: registering, by said user, a preference for which of said objects are to be displayed, said displaying of said objects being based on said registering [col.5, lines 23-30; col.3, lines 12-23; col.28, lines 12-15].

15. As to claims 6 and 12, Herz teaches that the method further comprising: automatically prioritizing parts of a Web service associated with said web page that are repeatedly used by said user [Abstract: lines 10-17, wherein “prioritizing” is equivalent to “ranking”].

16. As to claim 7, Herz does not specifically teach

- automatically deprioritizing parts of a Web service associated with said web page that are used less than said predetermined amount of times by said user; and

Art Unit: 2154

- splitting said web service pages each into one or more pages based upon said usage criteria specified.

However, since Herz teaches automatically ranking (or prioritizing) objects of a Web service associated with said web page that are frequently used by said user, it is obvious that web services that are less used would relatively receive lower priority and therefore should not be delivered to the user because the overall objective of Herz's system/method is to focus only on services that are interesting to its clients.

Consequently, it is obvious to further strip down less used objects from the originally complicated web pages because, by doing so, the network traffic can be greatly reduced.

17. As to claim 8, Herz does not specifically teach splitting said web service pages each into one or more pages based upon said usage criteria specified or splitting into pages on basis of classes with each page comprising parts of one or more classes.

However, Herz teaches that a full text of a document may comprise one or a plurality of attributes [col.11, lines 5-20]. Furthermore, Herz teaches grouping desirable objects into hierarchical clusters [col.7, lines 39 – 48], wherein the attributes of each object may be simplified by decomposing complex attributes into smaller numeric attributes [col.12, lines 60-66].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to split said web service pages each into one or more pages based upon said usage criteria specified (i.e., ranking) or splitting into pages on basis of



Art Unit: 2154

classes with each page comprising parts of one or more classes because Herz's hierarchical clustering tends to relate objects to appropriate classes and the web page splitting is in line with the principle of decomposing a complex attribute (which may comprise the entire textual document) into smaller ones.

18. As to claim 13, Herz further teaches that said prioritizing is based on structural information on pages representing said web service, said structure information having other than a hypertext mark-up language (HTML) format [Note that Herz's teaching is also applicable to many other environment [col.9, lines 12 – 50].

19. As to claim 9, since the features of this claim can also be found in claims 1 and 6-8, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 6-8 above.

20. As to claim 14, Herz further teaches linking split pages such that said user may selectively launch said services that the user has used less than said predetermined number of times previously [col.71, line 63 – col.72, line 8].

21. As to claim 16, Herz further teaches that said displaying comprises: displaying links as pictorial forms that are thumbnail forms of said web page, thereby providing said user with a visual cue as to whether or not said link should be followed [col.71, lines 56-63].

22. As to claim 17, Herz does not specifically teach bypassing said one of displaying only those objects, on user request, so that said user sees said page as served by a server.

However, in a practical manner, especially when a new service algorithm is implemented, it is typical to maintain the conventional service so as to avoid the situations when the new service algorithm fails or disliked by certain customers.

Thus, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have maintained Herz's pre-improved service as an option because by doing so Herz's system could address the need for all the potential customers.

23. As to claim 18, Herz teaches that the method further comprising: registering, by said user, a browser to be accessed through a proxy server [Abstract: lines 21-25; col.28, lines 12-15; col.36, lines 45-47].

24. As to claims 19-20, Herz teaches that the method further comprising: tracking a plurality of different users [col.5, lines 23-32] and tracking a plurality of different web services [col.9, lines 12-50].

25. As to claim 21, Herz further teaches that the method further comprising: specifying, by said user, at least one of a different threshold and a different criteria for identifying a frequent accessing of said objects [col.17, lines 18-27].

26. As to claim 23, Herz further teaches that the method further comprising:  
identifying a session of a user with a web service [col.28, lines 15-19].

27. As to claim 25, Herz teaches that Users' target profile interest summaries are automatically updated on a continuing basis to reflect each user's changing interests [col.5, lines 30-32].

Herz does not specifically teach using an extensible markup language (XML)-based schema language for specifying an update to a visit history.

However, since the major focus of Herz's method targets at client-server network environment, wherein hypertext markup languages such as HTML and XML are popularly used, it would have been obvious to also use the hypertext markup languages, such as XML, to communicate between servers and clients for specifying an update to the visit history, because Herz's profile elements are presented as hierarchical trees, while XML is a flexible formatting language suitable for presentation of the tree-structured information.

28. As to claims 27-28, Herz does not specifically teach registering, by the user, a browser of the user with a customizing service.

However, official notice is taken that registering and customizing a browser for special services such as guided touring among selected web sites and web pages is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 2154

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a customized browser in Herz's system because customized rules or functions may be built into the browser, thereby simplifying the control aspect of the related services.

29. As to claims 10-11, 15, 22, 24, 26 and 29-44, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-3, 6-9, 16, 18 and 21, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-9, 16, 18 and 21 above.

30. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/12/2004 for claims 1-44 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

31. Applicant argues in the remarks that:

1. The examiner's position on making the previous office action final by citing a difference between the non-final and final office actions, mailed on 12/17/03 and 5/12/04, respectively (see page 16 of Applicant's remarks).
2. Herz does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

32. Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's remarks:

Art Unit: 2154

1. As to point 1: it is noted that the issue is moot because of the filing of RCE. However, there has been no inconsistency between the previous final and non-final office actions. This is largely due to the broad claim language of claim 1, which uses "one of X and Y" type of structure as claimed limitations (wherein X represents "displaying only those objects of said web page which said user has accessed a predetermined number of times previously" and Y represents the other limitation), a prior art would read on the claim by merely showing X or Y. In the non-final office action the examiner first stated that Herz does not specifically teach X or Y (see page 3, paragraph 5, lines 8-10), then asserted that X is an obvious feature in view of Herz. In comparing to the final office action at page 3, lines 1-2, wherein the examiner stated that Herz does not specifically teach X, followed by asserting that X is an obvious feature in view of Herz. Since the feature of Y has not been relied upon in both office actions, it does not make any difference whether the examiner negated Herz's teaching of Y or not.

2. As to point 2, it is noted that even though Herz's teaching is aimed at information searching techniques, the prior art of Herz reads on the claims largely because of the broadly interpretable claim language (see paragraph #4 for details).

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

October 15, 2004

*Wen-Tai Lin*  
10/15/04